

Subject: SOKURENKO, Wolodymyr Havrylovych, Prof., Dean of Law Faculty, Lvov University, (See report on Subject dtd 25 Nov 1966) []

Source : ~~SECRET~~ Subject of []

Date : 3 Jan 1967

1. On 29 Dec 1966 Subject phoned Dr Klachko from Lavrynenko Yuri of New York, N.Y. and arranged for a visit to her at 16.00 hrs same day.

On his arrival, he introduced himself as Dean of Law Faculty at Lvov University, visiting now the US on a UNESCO scholarship and working here on the development of Ukrainian state-law thought in 1870-1890 and particularly on Drahomanov, Pavlyk, Podolynsky (Serhiy of Poltava), and Terlecky (Ostap). He knew about Dr Kl from his people in the Mission and just now she was also recommended to him by Lavrinenko. Subject wondered if she could help him in his research by her advice or recommendations, but above all he was eager to see her as he met her at Lvov University in 1963. He knew Dr Kl was writing at one time on Ukrainian history.

Dr Kl could not help him very much in his field and the conversation turned soon to a political discussion. Dr Kl had prepared 17 questions which she was going to put to him and so she did. Following is the gist of his replies, which he gave quite willingly. It was Dr Kl's impression that he took pains to convince her in his sincerity and to make him ^{self} look "broadminded and independent". At 21.15 hrs they were joined by Viktor CHERNIAVSKY and his wife Rita, and together stayed until 01.00 hrs. Beside Dr Kl was Eve. Subject seemed to be somewhat surprised by the news Dr Kl was expecting Cherniavsky but then murmured something to the effect that actually it was even better they (Cherniavskis) will see him here.

2. Constitution. The Constitution Commission headed by Khrushchev has been disbanded and a new one organized instead. In ~~his~~ Subject's opinion Khrushchev has partly suffered because of his directives for the Commission. He didn't know himself what he was doing and changed those directives quite frequently.

See 27 Jan
memo
LSB/RR

See also
25 Nov 1966 report

Aug. 1967 []

One thing, however, was sure, lately he ^{had been} ~~was~~ against any further liberalization and decentralization in the economy and against an increase of rights of Union Republics.

The main problem the present Commission has to solve is economic. The new constitution will have to lay the ground for efficient and proper functioning of Soviet economy. That's why not only legal but above all ~~many economic~~ experts have been put on the staff of the new Commission.

Subject is convinced that the present trend is toward further general liberalization in the economic planning and further increase of republic competences in political and cultural domains. Simultaneously there will be an increase of rights of communities and individuals.

All that was conducive to further changes in nationalities policy. SHELEST initiated something what could be called a new skrypnykivshchyna, a new Ukrainization and this progress will continue. Of course, its pace is much slower than in 1920's but it will be recompensated by its "durability and stability."

The process of Ukrainization is irreversible. Things simply went by now too far and no one could stop the progress. Of course, not all could be achieved at once, one has to be patient.

2. Agriculture. This topic ^{was} raised in Subject's reply on Dr Kl's question about the Constitution Commission. Subject mentioned that of a very great importance in economic policy happened to be agriculture which remains in a very sad condition. "Only after West Ukraine's unification with Great Ukraine we realized how important were private incentives for a peasant". Subject did not approve of anti-kulak campaign at one time because in his opinion it was too harsh and killed "initiative" in peasants in general. "Now we shall have to find new methods to re-vive "peasant initiative". Of course, there could be no liquidation of collective farm system which is absolutely right, it will only have to be improved by establishing measures conducive to getting peasants interested in higher production.

Subject could not say what these measures would be but KOSYGIN should certainly

think of something right. On the whole Subject praised KOSYGIN as a good economist and "professionalist".

3. Referring to Soviet economy in general Subject stressed that the new liberalization course should not be credited to LIBERMAN only because in reality many other economists did much more in this respect. "Of course, the West knows only Liberman because he is Jewish and Jews are interested in making him famous." On another occasion Subject called LIBERMAN "a clever Jew who knew how to make ^{known} his and others' ideas as his own only, abroad".

4. Asked what in his opinion state form would be best for Ukraine Subject replied that he could only think about a federation or confederation with "with proper contacts" but on the whole it was a very difficult question and he would not even raise, for instance, at seminars with his students.

5. Persecution of Lawyers. This question was pressed upon him by OLYNYK of Washington, D.C. He wanted some information on lawyers allegedly arrested and quietly liquidated in Lvov and other places. Subject heard nothing about the affair and doubted it even happened in recent years. He, as a lawyer, knew practically all lawyers in Lvov, and many in other places and he knew of no one "having disappeared". Besides, "quiet liquidation could have happened under Beria but not now. There could be trials behind closed doors to which public wouldn't be admitted but not secret trials a la "old times".

6. Arrests and trials of intellectuals. Yes, there were arrests and trials in 1965/66. Some people were arrested and released, others - sentenced. Subject talked about it with PAVLYCHKO and the latter told him that in Lvov there were only 6 or 7 individuals arrested, and four sentenced. They were sentenced for ^{their} anti-governmental writings and ^{anti-Soviet} literature in general. Subject stressed that there a paragraph on the basis of which they were sentenced so there was no arbitrariness from a legal point of view. He did not want, however, to spruce the matter from purely human and political angle. Most people were sentenced to 1 1/2 or 2 years.

SECRET

In other words the terms were not harsh. On the whole he would like to stress that Soviet authorities do not apply harsh measures nowadays but resort to persuading measures. Subject gave the following example: a year or so ago a young female student and her male colleague ^{at Lvov University} started writing and disseminating secretly some pamphlets against Russians and in favor of independent Ukraine. "We learned about it but instead of punishing them, we did something else. Namely, we called them to the office and explained to them how wrong they were, and asked them whether they wanted to make any career in the Soviet Union. They replied that obviously they were going to work in the Soviet Union and in their professions they were studying for. Then we told them that if they wanted to finish studies and start on their careers they better stop writing about independent Ukraine. And they gave up."

In same manner authorities approach today all young people, writers and poets, and avoid any harsh or punitive measures.

7. Ukrainian schools and publication in ^{the} Russian Republic.

Things stand very badly but to a great extent Ukrainians themselves are responsible for that. There are only 3 or 4 ~~but~~ desiatyletkas in Kazakhstan. Indeed, no Ukrainian papers or books are available for Ukrainian in the RSFSR. But recently there is more and more outcry about it and this is good. It is also good that emigration has raised this problem. The stronger the outcry there and here in the emigration the sooner things will get corrected.

8. On this occasion Subject touched on emigration's help in general. In his opinion; ~~the~~ cultural exchange and contacts between Ukraine and emigration was very important as an instrument of aid for Ukrainian people "all over the Soviet Union". One should criticize and do it very strongly but without "invectives". Also: when criticizing one or the other state of affairs one should not "explain" their motivation. For instance, if there is something wrong and it is being criticized in Soviet press, don't make a nationalist out of the author nor an anti-Ukrainian phenomenon ^{it is very dangerous} ~~it is very dangerous~~ to be changed or corrected. In short, don't suggest to us a motivation but stick to description of facts itself".

In such a manner the wrongs could be criticized from both sides: by emigres and Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, and the authorities or rather the Russifiers cannot use the argument that bourgeois nationalists argue the same way, with their interpretation of motivation which is anti-Soviet. "Don't describe your motivation as identical with ours".

9. "Ukrainian Lawyers". Subject stressed that he belonged to a group of lawyers who were making efforts to introduce Ukrainian language not only into schools and universities but into offices and juridical practice. He was sure they will achieve their goal though, of course, there will be obstacles.

Subject mentioned that those obstacles quite often come from Ukrainians themselves who want to doubly re-insure themselves. There are for instance in Lvov some known representatives of Ukrainian intelligentsia who send their children to Russian school allegedly to enable them to properly learn Russian "because they are being taught proper Ukrainian at home anyway". According to Subject Dr. Hl and Eve would be quite surprised when he would mention ~~these~~ these people's names.

10. Demonstration and Protests.

To the question on demonstration and protests of students, Subject replied that there were student and other demonstrations during the trial in Lvov and even flowers were thrown upon the arrested. The authorities connived at the whole affair because they did not want to make much ado about it. Thus, no demonstrators were even interrogated or in any other way persecuted. This was in line with the new attitude of authorities on such matters: instead of punishment use persuasion and don't ~~exaggerate~~ exacerbate the situation. On the whole there was a tendency to diminish the significance of the trials and their aftermath. The authorities wanted to forget about these events as soon as possible.

Another kind of recent demonstrations Subject could think of, were religious. Several months ago there were some baptists demonstrating in Lvov but again authorities used no harsh measures to disperse them.

11. Consulates of UkrSSR and Palamarchuk.

Subject criticized Palamarchuk, former Foreign Minister, for his statement that Ukraine was in no need of their own consulates and diplomatic representations. Subject himself is all for establishment of Ukrainian consulates. He hopes that such will be soon established in Canada, ^{one} in Toronto and another ~~one~~ in some other place where there are many Ukrainian emigres or rather immigrants. And he hopes there will be one in the USA as well. Again, a further development of cultural exchange with emigration will be conducive to the establishment of Ukrainian consulates abroad.

According to Subject, the lawyers' group to which he belonged, are making efforts to introduce for Ukrainians travelling abroad a Ukrainian instead of Soviet, all-union passport, and he hoped they will succeed. "Of course, we have to do all that very carefully and quietly". Asked how large was this lawyers group, Subject replied "we are quite numerous".

Palamarchuk's assignment in Morocco was a demotion. One could talk about a promotion only in case he had been sent as Ambassador to Australia or Canada. In Morocco he got nothing to do.

12. Subject agreed that obviously there was necessary some sort of "legislation" to speed up the progress of Ukrainization. He mentioned an example from his recent visit to Poltavskaya obl. In one of rayon towns he met ^{former} a friend of his, head of rayvykonkom, and was surprised to see all his correspondence in Russian. Subject asked why didn't he correspond in Ukrainian and his former friend replied that as soon as he gets proper instruction from above he will act accordingly.

13. Catholic Ukrainian Church.

Subject saw no chances for restoration of Ukrainian Catholic Church in West Ukraine at present. He saw no room for a co-existence of two so different but so well organized forces in the Soviet Union as the party and the Catholic church. It is different with Orthodox church

which was never really strong, neither "ideologically" nor organizationally.

Subject suggested that Ukrainian Catholics in Lvov should demand from Polish priests at Cathedral to ^{have} read mass in Ukrainian by their own priests. He thought it was now allowed and after GROMYKO'S visit to the Vatican, "it will be even more so..."

14. Nationalities problem. Subject did not think Yugoslavia had solved her nationalities problem and he did not want Soviet nationalities question solved the same way. He was Ukraine will get more concessions in the future and is on the way to "something more like other people's democracies". "Anyway, we won't be what you call Moscow's colony".

15. "Spovid" by Les Lersta. After having looked at the pamphlet (published by the Society for Cultural Contacts with Ukrainians Abroad) Subject agreed with Dr Kl's criticism and suggested she send her critique on paper to SHOLYCH, KOLOSSOVA, NEDBAYLO, and others in Kiev. Also she should not forget about TRONKO.

16. Subject attacked Suchanist for having published materials on the arson in the Kiev library because in his opinion it was not true there was "political motivation" behind it. If KGB wanted they could have done all that very quietly, with no trouble and uproar like it happened with Pohorzhalsky.

17. Subject thought it was a pity Dr Kl did not meet BILOKOLOS because he was an interesting person.

18. "American Ukrainian Progressive."

Subject met twice with Leon TOLOPKO in Lvov and once here in New York, N.Y. He also met the "chairman" of progressives - M. Torchenko of New York, N.Y. and other people. They impressed him as a "very miserable" unsophisticated element with which nothing could be done at all. The only exception, to a degree, is TOLOPKO who

at least is better read than the others. As to TORCHENKO, "he knows only how to drink toasts to friendship of Soviet peoples, peace, ect"

19. Subject had to have a meeting with Prof. SMAL-STOCKI of Washington, D.C. at his apartment as he wanted to get from him some material on Drahomaniv. However, when Subject came to his house, he found there on the door a note saying that Prof Smal-Stocki had to leave unexpectedly and could not keep the appointment.

20. Subject expressed his surprise at the ignorance about Ukraine he had found in the States. He went to Chicago, Ill and other places and often had to sketch the map of Ukraine to give basic informations to people with college education.

21. At Subject's Faculty only two lecturers, one Russian and another Jewish, read their lectures in Russian, the rest in Ukrainian. At Kiev University, at Law Faculty only about 10-15% in Russian.

22. Subject might go to the World Congress of Political Sciences in Brussels and asked Dr Kl to send him a prospect.

23. Subject is married, has a Volga-car and a garage. On his way home ~~happy~~ from the States he will make stops in London, England; and Vienna, Austria.

24. CHERNIAVSKY and wife brought gifts for Dr Kl (horilka, chocolates, and books). CHERNIAVSKY explained "the interview incident" with BILOKOLOS and put most of the blame on Shevchenko who wanted him to "settle this matter with Dr Kl".

Rita hoped they will be able to get their children to New York in summer. It will be decide about it in March 1967.

CHERNIAVSKY suggested Dr Kl read the article by Lyman in the later's Notatnyk on the latest congress of Union of Writers of Ukraine in Kiev. Otherwise- there was only small talk of no importance.

*Accepted
for
Cherniavsky
file*

SECRET

-9-

CHERNIAVSKY mentioned again that soon Iyvvnenko (the late sculptor) will be rehabilitated and it was mainly Cherniavsky's credit who raised this question with SHEVEL in Kiev and here.

CHERNIAVSKY asked also Dr KI to get him the following books:

Istoriya Ukrayinskoho Kino by I. Berest

Zvyzhayi Nashcho Marsdy by Voronay